

Scott E. Gizer, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 12216
sgizer@earlysullivan.com
Sophia S. Lau, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 13365
slau@earlysullivan.com
EARLY SULLIVAN WRIGHT
GIZER & McRAE LLP
8716 Spanish Ridge Avenue, Suite 105
Las Vegas, Nevada 89148
Telephone: (702) 331-7593
Facsimile: (702) 331-1652

Kevin S. Sinclair, NV Bar No. 12277
ksinclair@sinclairbraun.com
SINCLAIR BRAUN LLP
16501 Ventura Blvd, Suite 400
Encino, California 91436
Telephone: (213) 429-6100
Facsimile: (213) 429-6101

Attorneys for Defendants
FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE GROUP, INC. and FIDELITY
NATIONAL TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY

Gary L. Compton, State Bar No. 1652
2950 E. Flamingo Road, Suite L
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

US BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,

Plaintiff,

VS.

FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE GROUP,
INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:21-cv-01454-JCM-NJK

MOTION TO STAY CASE

Defendants Fidelity National Title Group, Inc. and Fidelity National Title Insurance Company (collectively, “Defendants”), by and through their undersigned counsel from Sinclair Braun LLP and Early Sullivan Wright Gizer & McRae LLP, hereby move to stay the instant action pending the final disposition of *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Fidelity National Title Ins. Co.*, Ninth Cir. Case No. 19-17332 (District Court Case No. 3:19-cv-00241-MMD-WGC), where the Ninth Circuit has scheduled oral argument to occur on October 20, 2021. Defendants bring the

1 instant motion on the grounds that the appeal in that case involves the judicial interpretation of
2 similar contractual provisions as those at issue in the instant case under nearly identical
3 circumstances. As such, the anticipated decision of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals could
4 potentially be case-dispositive of the instant dispute (and thus could radically affect the need for
5 otherwise-costly discovery in this case, as well as avoid the unnecessary expenditure of judicial
6 resources on pending and possible future motions).

7 Dated: August 16, 2021

EARLY SULLIVAN WRIGHT
GIZER & McRAE LLP

9

10

By: /s/-Scott E. Gizer

SCOTT E. GIZER

Attorneys for Defendants

FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE GROUP,
INC. and FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE
INSURANCE COMPANY

11

12

Dated: August 16, 2021

SINCLAIR BRAUN LLP

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

By: /s/-Kevin S. Sinclair

KEVIN S. SINCLAIR

Attorneys for Defendants

FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE GROUP,
INC. and FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE
INSURANCE COMPANY

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 As the District Court is well aware from its own docket, this is one of dozens of nearly-
 4 identical cases pending in the District of Nevada between national lenders (for example, Wells
 5 Fargo, U.S. Bank, Deutsche Bank, and HSBC), on the one hand, and their title insurers (for
 6 example, North American Title, Fidelity, Chicago Title, Commonwealth Land Title, and Old
 7 Republic National Title), on the other hand. While there are some discrete factual nuances to each
 8 of these cases,¹ the basic fact pattern in each case is ostensibly the same: the bank or its
 9 predecessor made a home mortgage loan secured by a deed of trust. The title insurer underwrote a
 10 policy of title insurance in favor of the original lender at the time that the deed of trust was
 11 recorded. Years later, the borrower(s) fell behind on his, her, or their HOA assessments. The
 12 HOA foreclosed on its assessment lien. The bank tendered a title insurance claim, which was
 13 denied. The bank then sued for breach of the insurance policy and insurance bad faith. The instant
 14 case brought by plaintiff U.S. Bank National Association (“U.S. Bank”) against defendants
 15 Fidelity National Title Group, Inc. and Fidelity National Title Insurance Company (collectively,
 16 “Defendants”) follows the same basic fact pattern. (*See ECF No. 1-1, ¶¶ 44-45, 53-57, 65-76.*)

17 As the District Court is also well aware from the dozens of stipulations it has entered
 18 staying many of these cases,² the Ninth Circuit is currently entertaining an appeal that may
 19 resolve the central insurance coverage question presented by this case, *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v.*
 20 *Fidelity National Title Ins. Co.*, Ninth Cir. Case No. 19-17332 (the “*Wells Fargo II Appeal*”).

21
 22 ¹ For example, in some cases the lender sued the winning bidder at the HOA foreclosure
 23 sale. In other cases, the winning bidder sued the lender. In some cases, the lender tendered the
 24 super-priority lien amount or attempted to tender the super-priority lien amount. In other cases, it
 25 did not. In some cases, the lender prevailed in the underlying litigation against the winning
 26 bidder. Other cases settled. And, in other cases, the third-party buyer defeated the lender.

27 ² Indeed, this Court has granted contested motions to stay in several of these HOA lien
 28 disputes, oftentimes staying the case before briefing on the motions to stay had concluded,
 including *The Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:20-cv-1394-JCM-BNW, ECF No. 63 in that action; *Deutsche Bank National Trust Company v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:20-cv-02268-JCM-VCF, ECF No. 47 in that action (stay granted prior to an opposition being filed); *U.S. Bank National Association v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:21-cv-00537-JCM-BNW, ECF No. 19 in that action (stay granted prior to a reply being filed).

1 That case involves the interpretation of the 1992 form of the American Land Title Association
 2 (“ALTA”) loan policy of title insurance, as well as the ALTA 9/CLTA 100 and the ALTA
 3 5/CLTA 115.2 endorsement. This case involves that exact same form insurance policy with those
 4 same endorsements. Defendants respectfully submit that the forthcoming Ninth Circuit decision
 5 could potentially impact the disposition of this case, including greatly impacting the forthcoming
 6 motions to dismiss which Defendants intend to file, to say nothing of the effect such a decision
 7 may have on the scope of necessary (or potentially unnecessary) discovery in this case. For
 8 example, if the Ninth Circuit finds that the Policy does not afford coverage for claims like those
 9 asserted by Wells Fargo in the *Wells Fargo II* Appeal and like those asserted by U.S. Bank in this
 10 case, then there would be no need for *any* costly depositions, expert reports, or other discovery in
 11 this case, and the instant action may be disposed of by way of a simple motion to dismiss.
 12 Obviously, if the Ninth Circuit provides guidance on the meaning of the relevant statutory and
 13 contractual provisions, then that guidance will likely control across all of these cases. Stated
 14 differently, if the Ninth Circuit interprets the relevant statutes and contract provisions, it seems
 15 unlikely that the “losing” side (i.e., lender or insurer) would have a compelling argument that the
 16 statute or form contract “means something different” in this case. It simply makes more sense to
 17 “wait and see” what the Ninth Circuit says in the *Wells Fargo II* Appeal before undertaking the
 18 expense of this briefing, for which Ninth Circuit determination may be case dispositive.

19 **II. THE COURT HAS INHERENT POWER TO STAY THIS CASE**

20 The power to stay proceedings is incidental to the inherent power in every court to control
 21 the disposition of its cases in the interests of efficiency and fairness to the court, counsel, and
 22 litigants. *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254–55 (1936). “The exertion of this power calls for
 23 the exercise of sound discretion.” *CMAX, Inc. v. Hall*, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir. 1962). A
 24 district court has discretion to stay proceedings pending an appeal of another action pursuant to its
 25 own inherent authority to manage its docket. *See Mediterranean Enterprises, Inc. v. Ssangyong*
 26 *Corp.*, 708 F.2d 1458, 1465 (9th Cir. 1983) (“A trial court may, with propriety, find it is efficient
 27 for its own docket and the fairest course for the parties to enter a stay of an action before it,
 28 pending resolution of independent proceedings which bear upon the case.”). Further, a district

1 court “has broad discretion to decide whether a stay is appropriate to ‘promote economy of time
 2 and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.’” *Asis Internet Services v. Active Response Grp.*,
 3 2008 WL 4279695, at *3-4 (N.D. Cal. 2008) (citations omitted).

4 In determining whether to stay a case, courts must weigh “competing interests which will
 5 be affected by the granting or refusal to grant a stay[.]” *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098,
 6 1110 (9th Cir. 2005) (*citing CMAX*, 300 F.2d at 268). These competing interests include: “... the
 7 possible damage which may result from the granting of a stay, the hardship or inequity which a
 8 party may suffer in being required to go forward, and the orderly course of justice measured in
 9 terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law which could be
 10 expected to result from a stay.” *Id.* (*citing CMAX*, 300 F.2d at 268).

11 As set forth in the above section I, given the nature of these disputes (i.e., they all largely
 12 hinge on the interpretation of form insurance policies), it appears inevitable that the Ninth Circuit
 13 will speak on issues in *Wells Fargo II* that will bear upon the disposition of this case. If this case
 14 is not stayed, then the parties will likely expend considerable resources and time completing
 15 dispositive motions, undertaking fact and expert discovery, and then briefing additional
 16 dispositive motions that will likely be impacted by whatever the Ninth Circuit says in *Wells*
 17 *Fargo II*. It makes basic economic sense to “wait and see” what the Ninth Circuit does in *Wells*
 18 *Fargo II* before the Defendants and U.S. Bank incur these substantial fees completing motions or
 19 discovery, as it is obvious that the “winning side” in the appeal is then going to argue that the
 20 appellate decision controls the disposition of this case, the “losing side” in the appeal will argue
 21 the opposite, and either the District Court or the Court of Appeals will necessarily have to decide
 22 that issue (depending upon how far this case advances before the appellate decision in *Wells*
 23 *Fargo II* is issued).

24 Turning to the *Lockyer* factors, the first factor (i.e., possible damage that may result from
 25 the granting of stay) weighs in favor of staying the instant case, as there is no appreciable damage
 26 that will inure to either side from a stay. Defendants anticipate that U.S. Bank will argue that it is
 27 eager for its day in court, and that it will be “prejudiced” if there is any kind of delay in this
 28 proceeding. This is the “usual refrain” of every plaintiff, and there is nothing special in this case

1 that would set U.S. Bank apart from every other plaintiff that asserts it is impatient to see the
 2 inside of the courtroom.³ In reality, this is a relatively-small dollar dispute between two large
 3 financial institutions. Neither party will suffer any kind of “hardship” by deferring to the
 4 efficiency of waiting for the *Wells Fargo II* Appeal to be decided.

5 For the same reason, the second *Lockyer* factor (i.e., the hardship or inequity which a party
 6 may suffer in being required to go forward) also weighs in favor of a stay. In every single one of
 7 these cases, the lender seeks to recover its attorneys’ fees. Unnecessarily running up fees on
 8 motion practice and discovery will only exacerbate the dispute in each case, to say nothing of the
 9 burden imposed upon the dozens of third parties that have been and will be subpoenaed in all of
 10 these cases (many of which may be required to appear for deposition). Because it is obvious that
 11 one party or the other will try to argue that the *Wells Fargo II* appellate decision will ultimately
 12 control the disposition of this case, there is no good reason to incur fees and costs on discovery
 13 and motion practice that will necessarily need to be supplemented after the Ninth Circuit speaks.

14 Finally, the last *Lockyer* factor (i.e., the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the
 15 simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law which could be expected to
 16 result from a stay) weighs in favor of staying this case. For better or worse, one side (lender or
 17 title insurer) will likely find itself arguing that the *Wells Fargo II* appellate decision should
 18 control this massive body of cases, such that judicial economy (i.e., for the sake of preserving
 19 limited judicial resources) also weighs in favor of a stay.

20 **III. THE MAJORITY OF THESE CASES HAVE ALREADY BEEN ORDERED**

21 **STAYED**

22 There are approximately 100 of these cases between title insurers and lenders currently
 23 pending in the District of Nevada. The overwhelming majority have been stayed, almost entirely
 24 by stipulation of the parties (while a handful of the loan servicers that direct the prosecution of
 25 these cases on behalf of the banks are simply “stragglers” against the trend). These stayed cases
 26

27
 28 ³ Fidelity National Title Insurance Company withdrew coverage for U.S. Bank’s claim on July 26, 2017. (ECF No. 1-1, ¶ 74.) The instant lawsuit was not filed until July 26, 2021.

1 include:

- 2 • *Wilmington Trust v. Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:18-cv-
3 02023-GMN-BNW (Ordered Stayed on December 12, 2019);
- 4 • *Deutsche Bank v. Fidelity National Title Group, et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00220-
RFB-DJA (Ordered Stayed on November 26, 2019);
- 5 • *HSBC Bank USA v. Fidelity National Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-
6 00228-APG-NJK (Ordered Stayed on January 17, 2020);
- 7 • *Wells Fargo Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 3:19-
cv-00237-LRH-WGC (Ordered Stayed on November 27, 2019);
- 8 • *U.S. Bank v. North American Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00289-APG-
9 NJK (Ordered Stayed on February 20, 2020);
- 10 • *HSBC Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00333-
11 RFB-BNW (Ordered Stayed on November 26, 2019);
- 12 • *Christiana Trust v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-
13 00385-JAD-VCF (Ordered Stayed on December 10, 2019);
- 14 • *Deutsche Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-
15 00409-GMN-VCF (Ordered Stayed on December 13, 2019);
- 16 • *U.S. Bank v. North American Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00424-JAD-
17 EJY (Ordered Stayed on February 25, 2020);
- 18 • *U.S. Bank, N.A. v. North American Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00433-
19 JAD-BNW (Ordered Stayed on March 3, 2020)
- 20 • *Deutsche Bank v. North American Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00434-
21 APG-VCF (Ordered Stayed on January 24, 2020);
- 22 • *Wilmington Trust v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-
23 00449-APG-GWF (Ordered Stayed on November 27, 2019);
- 24 • *U.S. Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-
25 00498-APG-EJY (Ordered Stayed on November 27, 2019);
- 26 • *Deutsche Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-
27 00576-JCM-DJA (Ordered Stayed on December 5, 2019);
- 28 • *U.S. Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00584-
JCM-NJK (Ordered Stayed on November 26, 2019);
- *Deutsche Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-
00621-RFB-NJK (Ordered Stayed on November 26, 2019);
- *Deutsche Bank v. Chicago Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 3:19-cv-00649-
RCJ-CLB (Ordered Stayed on December 23, 2019);
- *Deutsche Bank v. Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-
00761-GMN-DJA (Ordered Stayed on December 6, 2019);

- 1 • *Wells Fargo Bank v. Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-
00803-GMN-EJY (Ordered Stayed on November 27, 2019);
- 2 • *U.S. Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00808-
RFB-EJY (Ordered Stayed on November 26, 2019);
- 3 • *U.S. Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00809-
GMN-BNW (Ordered Stayed on December 13, 2019);
- 4 • *Deutsche Bank v. Fidelity National Title Group, et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00924-
GMN-NJK (Ordered Stayed on December 4, 2019);
- 5 • *Wilmington Savings Fund Society v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co.*, Case
No. 2:19-cv-00959-JCM-VCF (Ordered Stayed on November 26, 2019);
- 6 • *U.S. Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00970-KJD-
BNW (Ordered Stayed on November 27, 2019);
- 7 • *Wells Fargo Bank v. North American Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-
01111-RFB-VCF (Ordered Stayed on February 8, 2020);
- 8 • *U.S. Bank Trust v. Old Republic National Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-01136-
APG-BNW (Ordered Stayed on December 18, 2019);
- 9 • *U.S. Bank v. North American Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-01154-RFB-
EJY (Ordered Stayed on February 10, 2020);
- 10 • *Deutsche Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-
01487-JCM-EJY (Ordered Stayed on November 26, 2019);
- 11 • *Bank of New York Mellon v. Fidelity National Title Group, et al.*, Case No. 2:19-
cv-01566-APG-BNW (Ordered Stayed on December 18, 2019);
- 12 • *Bank of New York Mellon v. Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Co.*, Case No.
2:19-cv-01601-GMN-DJA (Ordered Stayed on December 6, 2019);
- 13 • *U.S. Bank v. Chicago Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-01728-GMN-VCF
(Ordered Stayed on January 3, 2020);
- 14 • *Christiana Trust v. North American Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-01782-
APG-BNW (Ordered Stayed on January 31, 2020);
- 15 • *Christiana Trust v. North American Title Insurance Co.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-01868-
APG-VCF (Ordered Stayed on February 5, 2020);
- 16 • *Wells Fargo Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:19-
cv-01874-RFB-BNW (Ordered Stayed on February 10, 2020);
- 17 • *Wilmington Savings Fund Society v. North American Title Insurance Co.*, Case No.
2:19-cv-02209-APG-EJY (Ordered Stayed on February 18, 2020);
- 18 • *The Bank of New York Mellon v. Old Republic National Title Insurance Company*,
Case No. 2:20-cv-00024-JAD-BNW (Ordered Stayed on March 3, 2020); and
- 19 • *Christiana Trust v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:20-cv-
00115-KJD-DJA (Ordered Stayed on February 10, 2020);

- 1 • *U.S. Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.*, Case No. 2:20-cv-00380-
2 GMN-EJY (Ordered stayed on March 16, 2020);
- 3 • *HSBC Bank v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Co., et al.* Case No. 2:20-cv-
4 00419-KJD-VCF (Ordered Stayed on April 13, 2020);
- 5 • *Bank of New York Mellon v. Chicago Title Insurance Company, et al.*, Case No.
6 2:20-cv-00500-JCM-VCF (Ordered Stayed on April 15, 2020).
- 7 • *Bank of America, N.A., v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 3:20-
8 CV-00046-MMD-WGC (Ordered Stayed on December 23, 2020);
- 9 • *Bank of New York Mellon v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No.
10 2:21-CV-00127-GMN-EJY (Ordered Stayed on December 4, 2020);
- 11 • *Deutsche Bank National Trust Company v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et
12 al.*, Case No. 2:20-CV-01886-GMN-BNW (Ordered Stayed on March 29, 2021).
- 13 • *MetLife Home Loans LLC v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No.
14 2:20-CV-01798-GMN-VCF (Ordered Stayed on March 30, 2021).
- 15 • *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No.
16 2:20-CV-01887-RFB-EJY (Ordered Stayed on March 30, 2021).
- 17 • *U.S. Bank National Association v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case
18 No. 2:20-CV-01955-KJD-VCF (Ordered Stayed on March 30, 2021).
- 19 • *Deutsche Bank National Trust Company v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et
20 al.*, Case No. 2:20-CV-01920-KJD-BNW (Ordered Stayed on March 30, 2021).
- 21 • *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No.
22 2:20-CV-02254-APG-BNW (Ordered Stayed on March 31, 2021).
- 23 • *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No.
24 2:20-CV-02156-APG-NJK (Ordered Stayed on March 25, 2021).
- 25 • *JPMorgan Chase Bank N.A. v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No.
26 2:20-CV-02188-APG-BNW (Ordered Stayed on March 3, 2021).
- 27 • *Deutsche Bank National Trust Company v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et
28 al.*, Case No. 2:20-CV-02355-GMN-NJK (Ordered Stayed on March 25, 2021).
- 29 • *Bank of America, N.A. v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:21-
30 CV-00353-KJD-NJK (Ordered Stayed on April 23, 2021).
- 31 • *Bank of America, N.A. v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:21-
32 CV-00348-GMN-BNW (Ordered Stayed on April 28, 2021).
- 33 • *Bank of New York Mellon v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No.
34 2:21-CV-00350-GMN-BNW (Ordered Stayed on April 14, 2021).
- 35 • *CitiMortgage, Inc. v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:21-CV-
36 00352-GMN-EJY (Ordered Stayed on April 12, 2021).
- 37 • *Bank of America, N.A. v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:21-
38 CV-00349-JCM-DJA (Ordered Stayed on April 26, 2021).

- 1 • *Bank of New York Mellon v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No.
2 2:21-CV-00351-APG-DJA (Ordered Stayed on April 12, 2021).
- 3 • *U.S. Bank National Association v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case
4 No. 2:21-CV-00388-JAD-EJY (Ordered Stayed on April 16, 2021).
- 5 • *Bank of New York Mellon v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No.
6 2:21-CV-00397-APG-DJA (Ordered Stayed on April 22, 2021).
- 7 • *Bank of America, N.A. v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:21-
8 CV-00399-JAD-NJK (Ordered Stayed on April 22, 2021).
- 9 • *Wilmington Trust, National Association v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et
al.*, Case No. 2:21-CV-00406-JAD-VCF (Ordered Stayed on April 22, 2021).
- 10 • *U.S. Bank, National Association v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case
11 No. 2:21-cv-00453-JAD-NJK (Ordered Stayed on April 20, 2021).
- 12 • *Bank of New York Mellon v. Fidelity National Title Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No.
13 2:21-CV-00452-RFB-VCF (Ordered Stayed on April 22, 2021).

11 It is clear that, time and again, the various judges of this District Court (including the
12 instant Court) have determined that it simply makes more sense to stay cases of this ilk in order to
13 see how the Ninth Circuit rules in *Wells Fargo II*. This not only redounds to the benefit of the
14 Parties (by sparing them the expenses associated with completing discovery while a potentially
15 case-dispositive appeal works its way through the Ninth Circuit), but it spares the Judges of this
16 Judicial District from unnecessarily expending limited judicial resources on these cases that might
17 be controlled by forthcoming appellate precedent. As the instant case is subject to the same
18 considerations as the stayed cases noted above, the same logic should apply here and the instant
19 case stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's ruling in the *Wells Fargo II* Appeal.

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 For the reasons set forth above, Defendants respectfully move this Court to stay this case
3 in its entirety pending the resolution of the *Wells Fargo II* Appeal.

4 Dated: August 16, 2021

EARLY SULLIVAN WRIGHT
GIZER & McRAE LLP

6 By: /s/-Scott E. Gizer

7 SCOTT E. GIZER
8 Attorneys for Defendants
9 FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE GROUP,
10 INC. and FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE
11 INSURANCE COMPANY

12 Dated: August 16, 2021

SINCLAIR BRAUN LLP

12 By: /s/-Kevin S. Sinclair

13 KEVIN S. SINCLAIR
14 Attorneys for Defendants
15 FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE GROUP,
16 INC. and FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE
17 INSURANCE COMPANY